

Attorney's Docket 060258-0290657
Client Reference: 2990360US



CFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of:
PASI LAURILA ET AL.

Confirmation Number: 9575

Application No.: 10/082,348

Group Art Unit: 2686

Filed: February 26, 2002

Examiner: Iqbal, khawar

For: UTILIZATION OF SUBSCRIBER DATA IN A TELECOMMUNICATION SYSTEM

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT/RESPONSE TRANSMITTAL

Transmitted herewith is an amendment/response for this application.

FEES

The fee for claims and extension of time (37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17) has been calculated as shown below:

CLAIMS		HIGHEST NO.	PRESENT	RATE	ADDIT.	FEE
AFTER	PREVIOUSLY					
AMENDMENT	PAID FOR	EXTRA				
TOTAL	30	-	30	= 0	\$ 50.00	= \$ 0.00
INDEP.	4	-	4	= 0	\$ 200.00	= \$ 0.00
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEP.				+		
CLAIM				\$ 360.00	=	\$ 0.00
TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE					\$	0.00
GRAND TOTAL					\$	0.00

FEE PAYMENT

Authorization is hereby made to charge the amount of \$0.00 to Deposit Account No. 033975. Charge any additional fees required by this paper or credit any overpayment in the manner authorized above. A duplicate of this paper is attached.

Date: July 7, 2005

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP CHRISTINE H. McCARTHY
P.O. Box 10500 Reg. No. 41844
McLean, VA 22102
703 905.2143

Attorney Docket: 060258-0290657
Client Reference: 2990360US



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of: LAURILA
ET AL.
Application No.: 10/082,348

Confirmation Number: 9575
Group Art Unit: 2686

Filed: February 26, 2002

Examiner: Iqbal, Khawar

Title: UTILIZATION OF SUBSCRIBER DATA IN A TELECOMMUNICATION SYSTEM

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated May 17, 2005, Applicant requests review and reconsideration of the patentability of the pending claims based on the following remarks.

Claims 1-11, 13-22 and 24-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Denenberg et al. (U.S. 20040248570; hereafter "Denenberg") and rejected claims 12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Denenberg and Oh (U.S. 6,591,458).

Applicant traverses the rejections because the cited prior art, analyzed individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed subject matter. For example, the cited prior art fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed method including "establishing a connection between the serving network and the terminal by means of a subscriber application comprised by the terminal; establishing a data transmission connection between the terminal and said subscriber database; checking the right of the terminal to use said subscriber database; [and] transmitting subscriber data relating to said subscriber database to the terminal, to the serving network, or to the terminal and the serving network in response to the terminal having the right to use said subscriber database," as recited in independent claim 1 and its dependent claims. Similarly, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the claimed telecommunication system wherein "the terminal and the serving network are configured to establish a connection by means of a subscriber application comprised by the terminal . . . to establish a data transmission connection between the terminal and said subscriber database;